



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,233

01/13/2004

Poul Egon Bertelsen

55682CON(71432)

5334

21874

7590

09/26/2008

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP

P.O. BOX 55874

BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

SASAN, ARADHANA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/26/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/758,233	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BERTELSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ARADHANA SASAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ARADHANA SASAN. (3) COLLEEN McKIERNAN.

(2) MICHAEL WOODWARD. (4) POUL BERTELSEN.

Date of Interview: 10 September 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nemoto (JP 03-240729).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's attorney argued that there was no motivation to modify Nemoto. Applicant argued the difference between the size of granules versus the size of the API. Applicant's attorney will consider submitting evidence of standard granule size that is larger than 600 micrometers.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Aradhana Sasan/ Examiner, Art Unit 1615	/MP WOODWARD/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615
---	---